

Rubric for Nuclear Science Writing Contest

	Poor	Moderate	Good
Creativity and storytelling	The writer does not use much creativity and sticks only to facts or bullet points. It reads too much like a debate or scientific article and not enough like a general-interest science essay.	The writer shows some creativity, but doesn't commit to any particular string in the narrative. There is a mix of story-telling and bland description.	The writer engages in a story or other creative narrative that entices the reader. Clever analogies or examples are used throughout, without compromising content depth.
Technical content	Not much information about nuclear science and technology is discussed. It is unclear if the writer has a good grasp of the topic.	The writer waffles between several aspects of a technical topic or doesn't introduce the technical aspect thoroughly. The reader is left with open questions or isn't sure if the information is accurate.	The writer clearly has a robust understanding of the technical topic and delivers enough new information to the reader. The information appears accurate.
Communication effectiveness	The reader is confused because the jargon is too heavy or the grammar and style are lacking.	The reader understands the message of the essay, but might remain confused about a few points or terms used. Analogies were helpful, but perhaps distracting or not sufficiently explained.	The reader can formulate a main point for the essay and understands all the technical terms that were used. The analogies are helpful.
Organizational flow	The structure is unclear, and transitions between paragraphs are confusing.	The general flow of the article makes sense, but some transitions are difficult to follow.	The organizational structure is clear and each paragraph transition is good.